

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/618,689	DOUBLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David C. Reese	3677	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) David C. Reese. (3) _____

(2) David Dorton. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 30 March 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.


Identification of prior art discussed: Freedland et al., Batten.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


ROBERT J. SANDY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: This case is currently under a non-final rejection. Mr. Dorton scheduled the interview to discuss the current listing of claims with respect to the prior art (see above) of record. Mr. Dorton reiterated the clients position that they felt that the prior art of Batten is not functionally capable of having the collet member clamped to the shank member without rotating said collet member. Mr. Dorton states that such a function would destroy the reference of Batten, and therefore is not anticipated by the prior art of Batten. The examiner disagreed, but stated that he would take the issue at hand to the primary of record (Flemming Saether) and get back to Mr. Dorton next week with the primary's viewpoint on said issue. In addition, the examiner suggested that the applicant focus on further claiming how the rib and valleys of the collet and compression member, respectively, have corresponding shapes and when in the released position fit within one another. Examiner stated that he would consider all amendments and remarks regarding the case in the official response to the most recent office action.